

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ANTHONY M. CHARLES,

Petitioner,

v.

WARDEN SCOTT FINLEY,

Respondent.

No. 4:19-CV-00558

(Judge Brann)

(Magistrate Judge Arbuckle)

**ORDER**

**MARCH 20, 2020**

Anthony M. Charles filed this 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition challenging a decision by the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) recommending that Charles receive six months' placement in a Residential Reentry Center, rather than the maximum allowable twelve months.<sup>1</sup> On February 13, 2020, Magistrate Judge William I. Arbuckle issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that this Court deny Charles' petition.<sup>2</sup> No timely objections were filed to this Report and Recommendation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Doc. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Doc. 14.

Where no objection is made to a report and recommendation, this Court will review the recommendation only for clear error.<sup>3</sup> Regardless of whether timely objections are made, district courts may accept, reject, or modify—in whole or in part—the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.<sup>4</sup> After reviewing the record, the Court finds no clear error in Magistrate Judge Arbuckle’s conclusion that the BOP did not abuse its discretion in determining that Charles should receive six months’ placement in a Residential Reentry Center. Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. Magistrate Judge William I. Arbuckle’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. 14), is **ADOPTED**;
2. Charles’ 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition (Doc. 1) is **DENIED**; and
3. The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** this case.

BY THE COURT:

*s/ Matthew W. Brann*

Matthew W. Brann

United States District Judge

---

<sup>3</sup> Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes; *see Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987) (explaining that court should in some manner review recommendations regardless of whether objections were filed).

<sup>4</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31.